A DEFENCE OF THE REASONS of the *Counter-poyson*, for maintenance of the Eldership, against an aunsvvere made to them by Doctor Copequot, in a publike Sermon at Pawles Crosse, vpon Psal. 84. 1584.

VVherein also according to his demaunde is proued Syllogisticallie for the learned, and plainlie for all men, the perpetuitie of the Elders office in the Church.

1586.

Z d
676

¶ To the Christian Reader.

Must (gentle & Christian Reader) declare two things for iustifying of this treatise following. Firste, why it came not out before, then why it commeth out nowe. Before, the trueth is, the author of the *Counterpoyson* neuer coulde gette the answeres in writing as nowe I haue got them. He sawe notes of them taken by a Doctor of the ciuill Lawe, which (as he then saide) made him rather thinke howe to contemne them, then to answere them. So this was the cause the author let it alone. Since that time I my selfe haue fallen vppon the whole Sermon in writing: so that it seemeth it goeth from hande to hande amongst those who delight in it. It may be some perceyue not the weakenes of the

the answeares. It may be, some beleeue the slaunders and lies made in it, both against the cause and the persons. Wherefore to shewe the trueth of the cause and her strengthe against all her enimies newe or olde, continued or relapsed, to cleare the trueth from olde & newe slaunderers, I haue made the Defence following. The Author of the *Counter-poyson* I am sure will take it in good part. This Defence the Author of the Aunswere may confute if he can. Thou mayest iudge of both, as Euidence of Reason shall leade thee.

The Lord graũt vs first to vnderstande his wil, then to practise it.

¶ That part of his ſermon which concerned Diſcipline.

BVT what is ſaide of the Church of Englande? Truely that it is no Church but after a ſorte: and why? Becauſe it lacked Diſcipline, for ſo ſay the Papiſtes, that it is not the true Church, but *ſecundum quid*, after a manner. But what of this? This is but a ſlaunder giuen to the church by them, as a citie can not ſtande without Walles, no more can a Church without Diſcipline, yet ſayeth the holy Father Maiſter *Gualter*, writing vpon the Epiſtle to the Corinthians: For lacke of Diſcipline, no man ought to depart from the Church. The ſame Father writing vppon the Epiſtle vnto the Galatians, whiche is applied to Iames King of *Sicile*, *Ego, ſi quis Diſciplinæ formam interrogat, in omnibus gentibus eandem conſtitui non poſſe exiſtimo.* I doo thinke that if any man doo aske of the forme of diſcipline, that the ſame cannot be appointed in all Countries and Nations through the worlde. In a Catechiſme printed here at London not long agoe, the Scottes Catechiſme, the queſtion is asked, *What may the Elderſhip doo in the Church?* The anſwere is made againe, *Admitte vnto the Sacramentes, and exclude from them according to God his worde.* Nowe as concerning Prieſtes, it is ſaide that they are worthie of great prayſe, which doo their office

inſtlie,

iustlie. And Saint Paule saithin his 5. Chap. 1. Timoth, The Elders that rule well, were worthie of double honour, especially they which labour in the worde and doctrine, we say the place is vnderstoode of the Preachers of the worde. *Peter Veride* and *Nicholas Emingius* in the 133. pa. of their booke say, That such Preistes are worthie of double honor. There is one noted, that when he was about the same matter and busines that there is spokē of, he affirmeth the Testament of *Reames* neuer came into his hands, and in deed I dare be bolde to say, it did not, for he intepreteth the place, that they which labor are worthie of double honour: but he did not speak of any Ministers, saue only thē which preached the worde sincerilie. Therefore he speaketh and maketh difference betweene Preacher & Preacher. I say not by the authoritie of the Testament of *Reames*, but by the authoritie of holy Fathers or Prophetes, which the Apostles doe note. S. *Augustine* he asketh the question, *Qui non bene præsunt?* but they, which do not labor in their calling; *Chrisostome* saith, *Bonus pastor vitam ponit pro ouibus*: A good Pastor will lay downe his life for his sheepe. And againe saith *Ciprian*, *Boni & fideles dispensatores, dupli honore digni sunt. S Ambrose* sayth, *Præsbiteri, & qui bene præsunt vita & doctrina, duplicem merentur honorem a subiectis quibus præsunt*: Presbiters, and they that doe gouuerne well, bothe in life and doctrine, doe deserue double honour of those subiectes, whome they rule: so that here we may see, he doth vnderstande the places of the preachers of the worde of God. But they say, if we should so expound it, we should make the Apostle to goe backwarde and not forwarde. Surelie, nothing lesse: for this is the sence, that they which labour, are worthie of double honour: they which do not, are worthy of none. So that here we may see that the interpreter doth not ex-

expound this place after the Church of *Rome* or of *Reams*, but *S. Ambroſe*, *Chriſoſtome* and *Auguſtin*. Here we ſee that the Apoſtle doth ſeeme to make twoo kindes of miinſters: The one which were occupied in the word, but not wel: & why ſhould that ſeme ſtraũge to make two kindes of preachers or miniſters? For my part I wiſhe with all my harte that al that are placed in Englande, were better then my ſelf, and that it were ſo through all Nations where the worde of God is preached, and I pray to God, that the Goſpell of Ieſus Chriſte were preached throughout the whole world. The Apoſtle ſayth, that in his time there were many which laboured not ſo much as he. I thanke God (ſaith the Apoſtle) I laboured better then they all, yet they deſerued honor: but not ſo much as he, becauſe they laboured not ſo much as he, for God hath not giuen to euery one the ſelf ſame gifte. Furthermore they define this worde (*labour*) is ſpoken to all, as well that are able to doo moſt, as thoſe that are able to doe leaſt: Therefore the Apoſtle writinge to the Theſſ. calleth them labourers, although there were ſome which were wicked amongeſt them. Furthermore, they adde this diſtinction *is* diſſolute, and cleane voyde of true diſcipline, if they bee but Miniſters, and take not ſo great paynes, yet they are worthie of honour, though not ſo great as the reſt, but of the honour of Widowes, and he ſpeaketh of honour of Widowes in Chap. 5. ver 1, 2. Honor the elder women as mothers, the yonger as ſiſters. Honor Widowes whiche are widowes in deed. The Apoſtle ſaith, Rom. 12. 6. 7. Seing then that when we haue giſte, &c. And agayne in Epiſt. 1. Cor. Cap. 12. 28. God hath ordeined ſome in Churches, as firſte, &c. Therfore they ſay, there muſt be *presbiteries* in the Churche: but I doo not

allow

allowe of this their argument, as they had Elders in the Church then, so it must be nowe. For the learned Father M. Gualter sayth, That there are certaine which would erect a presbiterie, they must proue they haue the same giftes as the presbiterie had then, Prophesie, working of miracles, and other giftes written in 1. Cor. Cha. 12. They that do these things are thought to trouble the order of the Church of God, and to bring in contention, the ciuill Magistrates went to get vnto them selues ecclesiasticall authoritie, but this turned into popishe tyrannie. There was a little booke printed in the yeare of our Lord 1558. that is called The admonition of Englande and Scotlande, you shall finde as much there. And if it doo please you agayne to looke into the conclusions of that booke, ye shall finde that there is one whiche doeth conclude heauier against Englande, then doeth Doctor Sanders.

The

The defence.

THE vvhole vvhich he ſpeaketh of Diſcipline, conſiſteth in two pointes, The one againſt vs: the other, A defence of him ſelfe. Where the one is not ſo falſe and friuoulouſe, but the other is as vayne and feeble. To begin, lett vs ſee howe he maketh vs charge the Church: then his Defence he maketh for it. Hee layeth to our charge, that we make the Church of Englande but a church *ſecundum quid*, after a ſorte.

Where that he ſlaundereth vs in ſaying we ſlander the Church: we proue it by double witnes, on our part our *wordes* and *deedes*: on his part, by his owne allegation in this place. For our wordes, our preaching and writings haue alwayes witneſſed, that we holde the Churche for a true Churche of Chriſt, from which no member may ſeparate him ſelfe: although he muſt diſallowe the wantes in her. We haue alwayes when ſubſcription was vrged, bin readie to ſubſcribe to the Article of her Maieſties authoritie, and to the ſubſtance of doctrine, in as large a manner as the Statut in that behalfe required. This wee haue declared by proteſtation and by writing, not onely to them, but to the moſt honourable Senate of her moſt Excellent Maieſties priuie Counſell. Wee haue by writinge defended the cauſe of the Church and our Prince, as much as they, that we ſay no more. From our actions howe many Demonſtrations might bee broght to approue our right iudgement, reuerend account, and ſincere affection toward the Church of Englande?

Haue

Haue we not (yea when we were vniuſtly againſt all law of God and man, depriued for not ſubſcribing) adioyned our ſelues to the Church in all the actions of the miniſterie of the word preached, of prayer, & of the Sacraments? Haue we not by perſwaſions continued many in the boſome of the church? yea whē through weaknes, becauſe of many abuſes they would haue departed. Haue wee ſought redreſſe by any other meanes thē by hūble ſupplication towards our ſuperiours according to dutie? Thus our actions approue vs to the church. His accuſation hath bin heard, let vs heare alſo his witnes: which as we ſaid, ouerthroweth his accuſation. He maketh vs to ſay, that *as a citie can not ſtande without walles, no more cā a church without Diſcipline.* We replie, there was neuer any that denied a citie without a wall, to be a citie, an orched without defēce, to be an orchard, a cornefielde without a hedge to be a cornefielde. Neither will any manne forſake his citie, caſt away his corne, deſtroy his vineyard, for lacke of a defence. Neuertheleſſe the wante of theſe things muſt be cōplained of in time. Behold how his own witnes ſpeaketh for vs. We haue ſeen how he faineth vs to charge the church, mark how wel he defendeth her. What maner of defence doth he make? not with the Word, but with 2. ſentences of M. *Gualter.* Is M. *Gualter* a more holy, learned, & ancient Father then *Peter Martir, Viret, Calvin, Beza, Bullinger,* and ſuch other, Who by preaching, writing, & other good meanes, haue mainteined this cauſe? We acknoledge *Gualter* to be a ſhining ſtarr: but we make not his glorie like vnto the glorie of God in all thoſe men. Howbeit let the ſtrength of his light ſhine out, and it ſhall not hurt vs, but melt away his aſſertion as waxe, and the Biſhops authoritie which he maintaineth as pitche. For want of *Diſcipline* (ſaith he in the firſt place) *no man ought*

Pſal. 80. 14
Nehe. 1.

to

so *departe from the Churche*: we confesse it, allowe it, subscribe vnto it. What is the secõd voyce? *I thinke that the same forme can not be appointed in all nations.* Lo it is *a thought*, no demonstration. Wil you allow his iudgement in this M. *Copquot*? Dare you doo it? Shall sweete and sower come out of your mouth in one sermon? Haue you not twise or thrise in this sermon made Discipline a note of the Churche, in these wordes: *The notes of the Church are three, the first, The word of God truly preached. The second, The right administration of the Sacraments. The last, True Discipline.* And hauing alleaged *Mat.* 28.18.19. you say, *By whiche place of Scripture, we may easilie perceiue, that these are the true tokens of the Church, where the worde is preached, The Sacramentes truly ministred, and where is true Discipline.* Now, if Discipline be one note of the Church, shal it not be the same in all places as touching the substance, as is the doctrine? Shall there not be a certaine forme of it, as S. Paule saith, there is of the doctrine, your first marke? Againe, how wil these wordes of Matthew, *Goe teache all nations, baptisinge them that beleeue, and teache them to obserue all thinges, which I haue commaunded you*, proue your Diuisions? Is it not becausse all men must not onely be taught and beleeue the doctrine, as the first and principal marke, nor onely be baptized and vse the Sacraments, which is the secõd, but also must be taught to obserue all constitutions, for *elections, abdications*, for the *essentiall difference of offices for the censures and spirituall corrections*, which you call true Discipline, the thirde marke? Howe then, is not this commanded Discipline certaine in *nature and forme*? And is it not cõmanded to al that beleeue and are baptized? What thẽ, shall M. *Gualters* sentence stand, & yours fall? After you haue seene this disagrement of M. *Gualter*, with him selfe, beholde how he disagreeth in this sentence with the Bishops and orders which you maintaine. In his cõmentarie on the 1. Cor. 5 where

2. Tim. 1.

where he hath the verie wordes you alledge: hee ſaieth, *That the Miniſters haue no Diſcipline further then rebukes by worde: That there muſt be no Eccleſiaſticall ſuſpenſion from the Sacraments: No excommunication: Finallie, there muſt be no Diſcipline but ciuill, at the appointement of the Magiſtrate, and that by ciuill perſons.* Will the Biſhops allowe this, that by the worde of God Eccleſiaſticall Gouuernours haue no authoritie to *ſuſpende*, to *excommunicate*? Will our lawes, will the Articles of the Conuocation houſe, will the booke of ordayning Biſhops, Prieſtes and Deacons ſtand with this? Thus *Gualters* breathe poyſoneth and choketh the Biſhops ſweete and pure Gouuernement. Thus farre his accuſation. His anſwere to our reaſons followe. Where firſte I pray the Reader to conſider well the queſtion betweene vs: which is one theſe worde of S. Paule in 1. Tim. 5. *The Elders which rule well, are worthy of double honour, eſpecially thoſe which labour in the worde and doctrine.* We ſay, this place mẽtioneth two ſortes of Elders, one which doo onely gouerne in the Church: the other which alſo are occupied in the miniſterie of the worde. He denieth this, and ſayeth it mentioneth onely two ſortes of Preachers, ſome whiche preach well, and ſome which take greater paynes in it then others. Thou ſeeſt the queſtion betweene vs (good Reader) wherein thou mayeſt thanke Maiſter *Copquot* (as we alſo doo) for making his meaning playne without any feare. For it argueth a good courage, openly at Pawles croſſe to iuſtle out the Arch-biſhops interpretation, to bring in his owne. The Arch-biſhop vnderſtandeth it of two ſortes of Miniſters: ſome that are Miniſters but preache not: ſome that preache and labour in the worde and doctrine. Well did Maiſter *Copquot* conſider that it was farre from the

Doctor Whitgift pag. 626.

true

true meaning of the Apoſtle, which neuer would account an ignorant Miniſter, vnſauerie ſalte, a blinde watchman, a dumme Dogge, and an Idoll ſhepheard, worthie either of double honor, or the name to rule well. Well alſo did he conſider that it was a ſmall piece of gouernement, to reade a fewe prayers or part of the Liturgie, and to doo all as he is preſcribed. Vppon good reaſon he left that corrupt meaning, I would he had as eaſilie receyued the full and proper meaning of the holy Ghoſt.

But let vs come to the matter in hande: Hee thinketh him ſelfe iniuried that he is charged to haue learned his aunſwere *of the Ieſuites, which he had* (he ſaith) *from holy Fathers and Prophetes.* If you bringe the interpretatiō of the Prophetes for you, we will put our hande to our mouth and giue glorie to the trueth and to you, although we muſt ſtill acknowledge that we redde it in the Ieſuites papers, before we heard it out of your mouth. But how is it that we heare a ſounde of Prophetes, but finde the ſentences onely of Fathers? Lette vs examine them notwithſtanding, to ſee if they diſcharge you from being the Ieſuites ſcholler. The ſentences which are alledged, make nothing for you, ſome are expreſlie againſt you. The firſt 2. are made to ſay, Such Prieſtes are worthie of double honour as do rule well, admit they ſay it: but do they ſaye this place maketh two ſortes of Preachers, whiche is the queſtion? Haue you no other Fathers then theſe firſte? Yes, *Auguſtin, Ciprian, Ambroſe, Chriſoſtome,* theſe are worth the hearing, let them ſpeak. S. *Auguſtin* ſaith, They onely *non bene præſunt,* whiche doo not labour in their calling. Ergo, the place of the Apoſtle is to be vnderſtoode of Preachers only not of gouerning Elders. I am not worthy for learning to beare Doctor Copyuot bookes: yet I

knowe

know the man whom he now seeketh to confute, would laugh at suche a reason. For all that I will vouchsafe an answere. *Augustine* in giuing no more for the interpretation of these wordes, *whithe rule well*, then that they do it which labour in their calling, doth applie it no more to Preachers onely, then to Deacons, Kinges, yea Shipmaisters, who all must labour well in their calling. Nay, by vsing so generall wordes in interpreting the first part of the verse, he manifestlie declareth, that hee vnderstood it was general to both sorte of Elders, both teaching and vnteaching, and so he might applie it to which soeuer sorte of Elders he had occasion to speake of. The same answere may serue the words which he sayeth are *Cyprians*, who yet can not bee founde either so much as to alledge that place, much lesse fully to interprete it. And if he thinke that *Cyprian* was such an enemie of vnteaching Elders, let him reade againe his Epistles, and he shall finde almost in euery Epistle, that hee is a great friende vnto them. He will sayperaduenture, those Elders were preachers: we answer, it is not credible that in one Church there could be so many as hee there nameth and paynteth out, especially in the time of persecution. But to put the matter out of doubt, his owne wordes are alledged, where hee saith, *He with the Elders, Teachers, and Readers, gaue the degree of a Teacher vnto Optatus:* Or if you will haue the reading as it is newly cast in a popish moulde, *Quando cum presbiteris doctoribus, lectores diligenter probauerimus, Optatum inter lectores doctorem audientium constituimus*, *when with the learneder Elders wee diligentlie tried the Readers*, wee made *Optatus* amongst the Readers a Teacher of those who heare, it shall make yet more against you: because here Elders are not onely distinguished from *Cyprian* the Bishop of that particular church: as from the Pastor, & fro

Cyprian lib. 3. Epist. 22

the

the teachers and readers, but also from some other vnlearned Elders, who although for gouernement they were apt men: yet were not so learned as eyther they were fitt to reade in the Church, or iudge of those who could reade and pronounce wordes and sentences according to their iust measure, and proper grace. We haue sifted Ciprian, let vs looke in to Chrisostome: He is made to say, *A good Pastor layeth downe his life for his sheepe.* He doeth so saye, but the (a) name of shepheard both in holy and prophane write, is cõmon to gouernours, both ciuill and ecclesiasticall, as well as to Teachers. Further, if one do wel marke the course of Chrisostomes cõmentarie in that place, he shall finde him against you: becaus when he speaketh of the firste part of the verse, he vrgeth no necessitie of doctrine: but comming to the second, he sheweth that those kinde of Elders which are occupied in the worde, are most to be honored, becaus they susteine great labour in teaching. His wordes are: *Quid est autem bene praesse? audi dicentem Christum: Pastor bonus animam ponit pro ouibus. Bene igitur praesse, hoc est, nulli parcere illorum regiminis gratia: maximè inquit, qui laborant, in verbo & doctrina: vbi modo sunt qui dicunt sermone & doctrina non opus est: & hos omnium maximè iubet honorari, causamque addit, dicens: Nullum enim laborẽ sustinent:* that is, *What is it to rule well? heare Christ speaking or telling it: A good shepheard layeth downe his lyfe for his sheepe. Therefore to rule well, is this, to spare none, or nothinge, for the sake of their gouernement: especially (sayth he) those which labour in the worde and doctrine: where are they nowe which saye, there is no neede of the worde and doctrine: and he commandeth that these be chieflie honoured, and sheweth the cause, saying: becaus they susteyne much labour.* By all whiche is manifest, first that the first part of the vers, he vnderstãdeth onli of gouernement (for giuing the ful sẽse of it, he maketh it to be to spare none in respect of their gouernment) & so maketh with vs Elders which go-

(a) Num. 27 Actes 20

Poimenes laon in the Poet.

gouerne onely: and Elders whiche also teache. Secondlie, seeing he doeth by the seconde parte confute those who sayde, there is no neede of doctrine: he sheweth that although some are to gouerne onely, yet some which must haue great honour, must teache also. Yea, if he had vnderstoode your sense of this place, he would haue saide vpon the first part of the verse: *All must teache well*, therefore there is neede of doctrine in euerie place: this argument could not haue bin left out, and had bin more necessarie, if he had seene that to be the meaning of the Apostle. Lastlie, in confutinge by this reason their negligence, *because they must labor in the worde*, and not with yours, because *they must labour more then others*: he sheweth your interpretation neuer came in his minde. Thus three of his witnesses haue done him much more harme then good. What sayeth the last? *Ambrose* sayeth, *Presbiters, i. Elders, and those whiche gouerne well, both in life and doctrine, deserue double honour, of those who are vnder them.* Is this to proue that Ambrose vnderstandeth the place of Preachers only: when besides those which gouerne both in life & doctrine, he speaketh of Elders and Auncientes? If you wil say that (*and*) doeth not here couple diuers thinges, but interpret only, what reason haue you to proue it? Seeing he doeth alledge the texte expressely as we doo? What goeth before, what followeth after to proue it? Nay, in the last wordes he would then haue saide, They deserue double honour, of those whom they teache, but because hee woulde make it generall to both, hee sayeth of those that are vnder them: which may haue relation to both sortes of Elders. If Ambrose had misliked this office, or not counted it perpetual, you had had some reason to interprete Et (and) by these words *that is*:

but

But seeing he calleth for it and cõplaineth for the decay of it, as we doo: seeing he proueth it by the same places wee doo: his interpretation hath no coulor to mainteine it self. The first is manifest by his wordes on 1. Tim. 5. *Vnde & Synagoga, & postea Ecclesia seniores habuit, quorum sine consilio nihil agebatur in Ecclesia. Quod qua negligẽtia aboleuerit, nescio, nisi fortè Doctorum desidia, aut magis superbia, dum soli volunt aliquid videri:* that is, Whence also the Synagogue, and after the Church had Elders, without whose counsell nothinge was done in the Church: which, by what negligẽce it is worne out of vse, I knowe not, vnlesse perhaps by the slothe of the Teachers, or rather their pride, whileſt they alone will seeme to be somewhat. The second is manifest by his interpretation of the 1. Cor. 12. which we alledge (*Hee hath set in his Church gouernors*) of which wordes his whole interpretation (after he had spoken vppon the former wordes of the Teachers) is: *Sunt & gubernatores qui spiritualibus vtinaculis, hominibus documẽto sunt: There are also gouernors which with spirituall bridles order mẽ.* Where, in saying, there are also, he sheweth besides the teachers, there are also rulers: and such as rule with spirituall bridles, not with the ciuill sworde. Thus the Fathers are heauie friendes to this interpretation. It may be notwithstanding he can so confute our reason brought against his misinterpretatiõ, as we must of force yeelde it into his handes. For triall sake therefore, we come to his answere. Wherein obserue two faultes whiche are generall: then you may the better deale with the particular deceites of his answere. The one is, that he cleane passeth by one principall reason, which is made against him, and it is this: If the Apostle had ment to haue made two sortes of Preachers, hee should haue saide, *They which rule well in worde and doctrine, are worthie of double honor, especiallie those which labor in it, or labor more then others:* but the Apostle hath no wordes nor circumstance, to make the word &

doctrine cõmon to both. For by what law of interpretation, will you doo it? Will you interprete, *Ruling by teaching? gouernement by doctrine?* One diuers thing by another? Is that to interprete, or to confounde? An other faulte is, that hee repeateth the fourth reason, but maketh no aunswere at all vnto it. The cause peraduenture is, for that it was concluded in a connexiue syllogisme, not a simple or categoricall. I will therefore doo so much for the author (or rather him) as turn it to his liking Thus:

What soeuer is a common ductie of all Elders that can not be assigned by the Apostle, as a proper cause of an especiall honor in some sorte of good Preachers.

But *Copiatein* to take great paynes in their office, &c. is a common dutie to all Elders, 1. Thes. 5. 12. Heb. 13. 17.

Ergo, *Copiatein* to take great paynes, can not be assigned of the Apostle as a cause of especiall honor in some sorte of preachers.

We will nowe expect his answere, although without cauill he can hardly answere it. Thus we haue beheld the common vertues of his aunswere, let vs looke into the proper strength in the particulars. To the second reason his answere is, that in this interpretation, *they doo nothing lesse then make the Apostle go backward and not forwarde.* For this is our meaning which we giue (saith he) *That they whiche labour, are worthie of double honour: they which doo not, are worthie of none.* A sounde answere, which is contrarie to him selfe, and toucheth not the force of that obiected against him. Shewe the firste. It is manifest by that which after he saith: *that this place is ment of suche as preache well: and of some that in preaching well, take more labor then other.* Here he vnderstãdeth it *of those which take any paynes, and setteth them against those whiche take none.* So he maketh the highest degree of honor due to that which if it be not done, he saith, *is worthy of no honor.* How cã that deserue or haue an excelencie

he-

of honor, which is cõmon to all that may haue any honor in their office? Besides this cõtradictiõ which is euident in his owne words, he toucheth not the force of the obiectiõ. The obiectiõ is: Whatsoeuer sense maketh the Apostle, in the second member of the verse, giue more to the part, then in the first to the whole, maketh him go backward not forward in his word especially. But this sense of theirs maketh the Apostle giue more to him that laboreth in preaching, which is but a parte, then to him which doth it wel, which is to do it with great paynes, puritie, wisdom, zeale, power, soundnes, fitnes, & many other things besides labor. Therefore this sense maketh him goe backewarde not forwarde, in his worde especially. This reason is playne. What saith the answer? Doth it distinguish? No. Doth it denie the first part? No. What then? It denieth the conclusion, against all rule of reason. Yet by what reason doth he denie it? By giuing an interpretatiõ, which doeth not make, either two sortes of Elders, or of sincere preachers, but only two sortes of preachers, one good & worthie of honor, an other euil, whiche take no paynes, worthie of no honour. So that this hauing no degrees of comparison (which are manifestly expressed in S. Paules words) can not so much as resemble the sentẽce of the Apostle, much lesse interpret it. His meaning here peraduenture is as after, that al that do it wel, shal haue double honor: but they especially, who take yet more paines in doing it well. This his meaning hath two fowle spots in it, as faire as he would make it. The first is against the rule of reason, because he beggeth the question: for to proue his denial of the cõclusion of our reason, he bringeth this meaning of his, which is the question we dispute about. The second fault is against plaine dealing in interpreting the scripture, & that in two respects: one is in interpreting *ruling well, or being ouer others well*, by preaching well. Which is to interprete the generall by the especiall.

If he ſay, one may do ſo where there is a Trope or an vnproper ſpeache: he muſt firſte proue by euident reaſon out of his text, or other ſcripture, that there is a Trope, elſe he ſeeketh a knotte in a ruſhe. Beſides this, a figure can not ſtande here, becauſe the Apoſtle doth ſpecifie the general, of being ouer others, into the ſpeciall of being ouer alſo in doctrine: ſo that he can by no meanes enter here vpō ſuch an vnproper ſpeache, but muſt be content to reade, *ruling wel, ruling wel*, not teaching well. After this ſtraunge interpreting, before this new coyned meaning (carying the very ſtampe of the Ieſuites) enter, he muſt (not without great blame if he look not to it) adde to the wordes of the Apoſtle. For, all the force of his interpretation ſtandeth vpon an addition, to the wordes of the holy Ghoſt: which is, to make him ſay, he that taketh *more great paynes then they whiche preache wel*: All whiche wordes, *more then others which doo it wel*, are neither in the Apoſtle in expreſſe wordes, nor in any of like force to them, neither hath he, or can he With any Syllogiſme conclude it out of his wordes. If he can, let him ſhewe his cūning. The worde *Copiazein*, whiche ſignifieth, to take great paynes, will not here helpe him: For it doeth not include a compariſon with others. For it is common to all Elders, much more good preachers. For the Apoſtle in makinge cōpariſon, ſaith, *en copois, in labors more aboūdant*: and ſo by adding the worde of cōpariſon to it, ſheweth it is not conteyned in the very word it ſelf. In his anſwere to the thirde reaſon, where he made three ſortes of Preachers, and euen thoſe that doo it not wel, worthie of ſome honor for defence: he ſayth, he ſeeth not why ſuch as take paines, may not haue *an honor ſuch as is dew to Widowes*: Wherin firſt he trifleth, fleeing frō the matter in hand to another. For he ſhould haue proued that his interpretatiō gaue not a ſingle honor to ſome whiche did not preache well.

1. *Theſ.* 5. 12

2. *Cor.* 11. 23

well. Secondly, he is contrarie to him ſelfe. Before he ſaide, here were vnderſtood only two ſortes of Preachers, good and euill: after he ſaide, good and excellent: Now, three ſortes are vnderſtood, ſingle ones, ſuch as may haue the honour of Widowes: double ones, ſuch as may haue double honor: and treble ones, which may eſpecially haue double honor. Wherefore (as the Author of the *Counterpoyſon* ſaid before, ſo I ſay againe, this is dallying, & not interpreting: And what ſoeuer he ſaye, this Diſcipline of his, is diſſolute. For if men preache well, they are worthie of double honor, whiche is more then the Widdowes honour, if oteerwiſe they are worthie (as he ſaide before) of none. His anſwere followeth to the laſt reaſon out of Roma. 12. 6. 7. Where the Elder for gouernement onely, is made a proper member of the church, differing in his proper action from the Teacher, Exhorter, Diſtributer: And out of the 1. Cor. 12. where God is ſaide (beſides all other miniſteries and giftes) to haue *ordeyned gouernours in his Church*: wherevnto he ſaieth, he denieth the argument, *there were ſuch then, therfore there ſhould be ſuch nowe Becauſe* (as M. Gualter ſaieth) *We muſt firſt proue they haue ſuch giftes of propheſying, doing of miracles, and diuers ſuch like as are there mentioned.* To all which we replie, firſt with thankes that hee yeeldeth to the trueth, & graunteth that ſuch were ordeyned of god. In the ſecond place we wil proue they are perpetuall, and then that it is vnreaſonable to demande of vs, to proue that now they haue ſuch giftes as he ſpeaketh of. We mainteyne out of theſe places, that they are perpetuall. Firſt, becauſe they are members ordeyned of Chriſt, hauing actions for the profit of the whole body. For vnleſſe he can proue God hath repealed them, who ſhall putt them off from the body? Secondly, the Apoſtle in the 12. to the Rom. reckoneth vpp none but perpetuall, as Teachers, Exhorters, Rulers, Diſtributers.

Nowe, him selfe (I dare say) will acknowledge the giftes of doctrine, exhortatiō, abilitie to distribute, & gouerne, with the actions proceeding from thē, to be perpetual, & still necessarie If thē the proper actions (as the Apostle there speaketh) of the members be perpetual, shal the members be mometarie?

Ephe.4.10. Doth Christ now giue doctrine, exhortation, gou-

1,Cor.12,28 uernement, and not Doctors, Feeders, and Gouernors? Or doeth he giue teachers for doctrine, and

Act.28.19. not gouernours for gouernement? Further, if the Churche daily need these for gouernement, and seeke orderly for them, and yet haue them not: howe is Christ present with his Church, to inable her to doo all he commaundeth? In the seconde place, doeth not S. Paul say he hath *set gouernors in his Church*. Howe can any man set them out then? They will saye, hee saieth, there also hee hath sette Apostles, which yet are not perpetuall. It is true: there are mentioned also teachers and helpers whiche are perpetuall. So this obiection ministreth vs occasion of a double reason: the one by equal comparison, as the teachers office (whereof the gifte & necessitie is perpetuall) for that cause remayneth, and the Church ought continually to call for men which are fitt for it, because God hath set them in his Churche. So for the Elders office, seeing their giftes of watchfulnes, abilitie to admonishe, and to aduise and gouerne doeth remayne, the Church is continually to cal mē fit for the same office into it, because God hath *set them in his Church*. Further, as no authoritie of men could haue removed the extraordinarie, vnlesse God had denied their extraordinarie giftes and calling: so no man can remoue these where the giftes remaine, & an ordinarie way of examination, & election doth remayne for their calling. Thirdly, the Apostle writing vnto *Timoth.* doth giue as general a charge for this sort of Elders and their continuance, as for the other whiche are teaching: therfore if you cā proue one perpetual,

you

you may also proue the other to be so likewise. For the precepts for their honor, their reasonable immunitie from accusations, their iust rebuke, their carefull ordination, are set downe, as common to both sortes, though, as in the first of honor, so in the rest the teaching Elders are especially to bee regarded. Lastly, they can finde no cõmandement, reason, or other groũd in the scripture, why the Pastor in his place shuld be perpetual, but we will bring the like for the Elder in his. One is more necessarie, wee graunt, but not more perpetuall then another: as the eye, or the tongue, or the hand is more necessarie thẽ the foote, the right ones more then the left, yet alike ordinarie & perpetual. These are our reasons to proue thẽ perpetual, which being set down for the vnlearned more grosely, we will also set thẽ down with some other in syllogismes, that he may the better deale with them, out of Rom. 12.

No mẽbers of Christes body hauing actions for the profit of the whole, may be thrust out or put to an ende by any humane authoritie. The Elders and Deacons are such members, Rom. 12. 4 8. *Ergo*, 1

Al offices whose giftes and proper actions are ordinarie and of perpetuall vse, they are perpetuall. The offices of Elders & Deacons ar such, as whose giftes of abilitie to gouerne, & distribut, & actions of distribution and gouernement, are perpetuall by their owne graunt. *Ergo*, They are offices perpetual 2

Out of the 1. Cor. 12. 28. No offices whiche God hath once set in his Church, may be put to an ende by humane authoritie. But the offices of Elders & Deacons, haue bin once set in the Church by God, *Ergo*, they may not bee putt to an ende, and consequently are perpetuall. Whatsoeuer offices haue the same cause of continuance, are alike perpetuall, though not alike excellent. The office of teachers, & of church gouernors & Deacons, haue the same cause, as the ordinãce of god, the cõtinuãce of their gifts, & of power of the church to cal thẽ, 1. Cor. 12 3

4

Rõ. 12. *Ergo*

Ergo, they are alike perpetuall. Whatſoeuer haue the like cauſe of ceaſing and remayninge, the cauſe of remayning being continued, they remayne, as the cauſe being ceaſed, they ceaſe. But the offices of Churchgouernors & Deacons with the offices of Apoſtles, workers of miracles, haue the like cauſe of ceaſing & remaining, to Wit the wil & ordinãce of God in continuing the giftes, and the ordinarie and mediat calling of the Church for the one, and his will in withholding the extraordinarie giftes, and immediat calling of the other. Ergo, they do by the like cauſe remaine that the other are takẽ away

5 Whatſoeuer haue the ſame general cõmãdement, and rules of examination, traill, ordination, abdication, honor, reproſe, without ſpeciall exemptiõ for any: are alike perpetual. But the offices of teaching and vnteaching Elders and of Deacons, haue the ſame generall commandement, &c. 1. Ti. 5. 3, 10. 1. Tim. 5. 17. 18, &c. Ergo, they are alike perpetuall.

6 Whatſoeuer offices are neceſſarie in euerie cõgregation for Diſcipline after the ſeconde priuate admonition: they are perpetuall: otherwiſe the remedie Chriſt hath appointed for ſinners, is not perpetuall. But an aſſemblie of Gouernours in expreſſe wordes of Chriſt, are neceſſarie in euery cõgregation for Diſcipline, after the ſeconde priuat admonition, Mat. 18. 17. Ergo, ſuch an aſſemblie is perpetuall.

7 Whatſoeuer offices were ordeined for ordinarie and perpetuall gouernement of the Church vnder the lawe, & hauing continued frõ Moſes to Chriſt, haue as the other offices of teaching & exhorting, bin newly increaſed and augmented by Chriſte to the Church vnder the Goſpell: thoſe are perpetuall: becauſe there can be no cauſe ſo great, found of altering offices of ordinarie giftes and vſe ſince Chriſt, as was betwene Chriſt and Moſes. But the office of gouernſng Elders adioyned to Teachers

and

and exhorters are such. Ergo, the assumption is proued by these places, Leuit. 4. 13, 14, 15. (Where the Elders, as bearing the person and sins of the whole congregation, are distinguished from the Priest & the Magistrate.) Iere. 19. 1. Where the ciuill and ecclesiasticall Elders are distinguished. 2. Chron. 19. 8. 11. Where for the matters of God, to the Priestes and teaching Leuites, are adioyned Elders, Hesr. 10. 8. Where the counsell of the Elders for excommunication is ioyned, though (distinguished from it) with the counsell and decree of the Princes touching confiscation of goods, Nehem. 8. 5. 8. Where the Elders in gouerning the Assemblie, are distinguished from the Priestes and teachinge Leuites. For counsell they are adioyned euen with the Prophetes, 2. Reg. 6. 32. Out of the newe Testament the places are pregnant and many, Act. 4. 5. & 6. 12. & 5. 21. Act. 13, 15. & 18. 8. So that this proueth the ordinance and continuance of them from Moses to Christ. That Christ cõtinued them and augmented them with giftes, as he did the offices of teaching and exhortinge, the place of Mat. 18. *Tell the assembly, and if he heare not it, leite him bee a Heathen and publicane*, doth proue it: for by vsing expresse wordes, proper to that order of theirs, hee doeth manifestly establishe it. The places whiche haue proued them ordeyned in the Church, proue this point also. Lastly, them selues graunt Christe ordeyned such, only they denie them to be perpetuall.

Nowe, if they demande humane witnes, what can they haue more cleare then that *Ignatius*, who (as they say, was S. *Iohns* Scoller) writing to seuen Churches, in euerie Epistle speaking only of such offices as were ordinarie and perpetuall, Bishopps, Elders and Deacons, doeth say (as hath bin alledged) that *No Church can be without her Eldership*. And least any man should say, he ment teaching Elders,

let

Lette them marke that hee defineth their office to be *a Senate of Counselers, and assistants to the Bishoppe in euery Church*: ouer which Bishop he acknowledgeth no Church-officer but Christ, without which Bishop it is not lawfull to administer the Communion, Baptisme, or performe any action in the Assemblie. His wordes are these: *What is the Eldership, but a holy Senat, the Counsellers and assistantes of the Bishop.* And a little before: *The Elders are as the Senat of God, and the bande and sinowe of the Apostles of Christ, without these the elect Church is not, no Congregation of Saintes, without these, Epist. 2. ad Tralles.* Here the office is defined, as consisting onely in gouernement. That in the Sacramentes they might only assist the Bishop, and not administer them, or doo any publike action, is manifest by these wordes: *It is not lawfull without a Bishop, eyther to Baptize, or to offer, or to prepare the offring, (i. the Communion) or perfect the gifte or distribution, but that which seemeth good to him, according to the good pleasure of God, that what soeuer you doo, may be safe and sure.* Ignat. Epist. 2. ad Smyrnæos, and in the same Epistle, *Therefore let all things be done of you, according to good order in Christ. Let the laye men be subiect to the Deacons, the Deacons to the Elders, the Elders to the Bishop, the Bishop to Christ, as he to his Father* In the time of Cyprian, they remayned. *Ambrose*, when they were fallen away, doeth complayne of it, and doeth make the cause of their falling awaye, not because they were not perpetual, nor yet because they might not continue, but the negligence and pride of the teachers.

oute thusian proscem zein oute dochen epitilein.

Nowe that wee haue proued that hee required of the perpetuitie of these offices: lett vs come to his reason, why he denieth them to be perpetuall, whiche is, because wee can not firste proue the Elders to haue such giftes of prophecying, dooing miracles, &c. But wee bidde him proue firste this strange and monstrouse assertion: that it is neces-

sarie

ſarie for vs to proue it. Secondly, we will ſhew him the vanitie and deteſtable abſurdities which folow this his demande. The vanitie may appeare by theſe reaſons out of the text. The gouernours and the gift of gouernement are as much diſtinguiſhed frō Prophetes & doers of miracles, as they are from teachers: therfore to require ſuch neceſſarie for gouernement more then doctrine, is to ouerthrowe the purpoſe of the Apoſtle, which is to ſhew howe euery office hath his ſeueral & proper gift. Secondly, if the vſe of ſueh giftes as he ſpeaketh of, be no part of gouernemēt, what neceſsitie is there of thē in Elders as they are Elders? Thirdly, we demaūd of him, whether he require theſe giftes in al Elders or in ſome, & in whom he doth require thē, whether he would haue all thoſe giftes to be in them or ſome only. If he require them in all, he muſt proue firſt that they were in al the Elders in the Apoſtles time, which he ſhall do *ad græcas kalendas*, that is, neuer. If he require all thoſe giftes in any, let him proue that any Elder was furniſhed with them al, which he ſhal neuer do. If ſome only, let him ſhew whiche are neceſſarie, and which not. And let him out of the ſcripture proue his ſaying, and we will yeelde. Thus we haue ſeene the vanitie of the demande, marke the abſurdities following. Firſt, that they make themſelues wiſer then the Apoſtle, who requireth no more in the dutie of an Elder, *then to be ouer the flocke with diligence*, Rom. 12. 8. 6. Secondly, they require more in the Elders thē the Apoſtle required in a teaching Elder or a Biſhop, when he giueth the rule of his examinatiō, 1. Tim. 3. Thirdly they may by the ſame rule throw out teachers, ſeeing in this place the Apoſtle giueth ſuch giftes no more to the Elders then to the teachers: eſpecially this conſequence is neceſſarie, becauſe the principall ende of thoſe giftes, being eyther to deliuer doctrine, or giue credit to it, is more neceſſarie for the teacher then the gouuernor. Fourth

Fourtly, seeing they vnderstande by Elders those who preach, and will haue none gouerning only, it remaineth that by his reason we must first proue those giftes to remayne in them, eare we can proue such to remayne. Lastly, seeinge these giftes were cõmon to priuate persons, yea to women, euen to all sortes of beleeuers, we must first proue (by their reason) these giftes to remaine, eare wee can proue there be any church or faithfull men in the world. These are the detestable absurdities which followe vpon this reason of theirs, wherby the answer to it is euident, that the Apostle setteth down there, both offices, as Apostles, Teachers, Prophetes, Elders, Deacons, and also some giftes, which were cõmon to all, as ornamentes to confirme for a time, Christian Religion: Now, although these giftes are long since ceassed, yet the offices may remayne without them: especially the offices of teaching, exhorting, gouerning, which are for their vse, & the giftes required in them, perpetual: euery part of which answere hath bin before cõfirmed in the particulars. Hitherto he hath labored against the trueth, to ouerthrowe it: Nowe, fearing that all the instrumentes he had, would not throttle the cause, so as she should no more open her mouth: hee seeketh to disguise her with a slaunder. Where we will first see what he bringeth: then we will maintcyne the contrarie. The summe of that he obiecteth is, *they which stande for Discipline, are thought to bringe in contention, and to vndermine the power of the Magistrate.* In this accusation first you must well obserue, hee doeth not, nor dareth not say, it is so, but that it is thought so. To which it may be answered, that it is thought, that the other side seeke to driue out the sufficient ministerie, that they alone may reigne, pille the people af her Maiestie; abuse thē & grind them, without hauing any of their filthines discouered. It is thought of some also, that they make a way

Iames 5.

Marke 16.17
Actes 2.16,
17, 18, 19.
Act. 21.8.
1. Cor. 14.
26.34.

way to Atheisme, Poperie, and all confusion, whyleſt they thruſt our ſo many worthie and paynfull laborers out of the L. Vineyard, and bring in ignorant, vngodly, riotouſe, idle and couetous perſons, in their ſteede. Nay, ſome of theſe are not onely thought, but manifeſtly by experience in manye places felt. Secondly, you may obſerue howe the light of his conſcience ſtroue with his affections againſt the cauſe. His affection and deſire was to diſgrace the cauſe it ſelf, as preiudiciall to the peace of the Church and ciuill Magiſtrate. Now, When in his cõſcience he found he could deduct no ſuch thing out of the matter of Diſcipline, hee turneth from the matter to the perſons, and ſayth, they are thought ſo to do. Why doth he not ſhew who they be that ſo thinke of them, vpon what groundes, by what ſignes and tokens, by what counſelles, writings, examples or deedes they haue giuen likelihood of it? If hee can neither conclude any ſuche matter out of the cauſe it ſelf, nor proue any thing againſt the perſons which ſeeke it. How, Is it not the maintenance of a malitions ſlaunder? We haue haue harde what he ſayth: will he adde no ground of it? Yes, An admonition to Scotlande, printed An. 1558. cõteineth cõcluſions as ſtraunge againſt the Eſtate, as *D. Sanders* (that traytors booke) doth. What doth it? Doeth it conteyne flat treaſon, that the Prince by any Eccleſiaſticall power may be depoſed or reſiſted? That the Queens moſt Excellent Maieſtie is an heretike, or receyueth not Diſcipline, and thetefore muſt be excommunicated, and after accounted no lawfull Queene? Hath any fauouring Diſcipline writtẽ theſe things, or the like? If he can not ſhewe any ſuch thing, what is he but a Preacher of ſlaunders at Pawles Croſſe? The booke he ſpeaketh of, to my knowledge, I haue not ſeene: neyther knowe where to haue it. Yet I aſſure my ſelfe, he can bring foorth no ſuche concluſions

cluſions from any which hath ſpoke or written for Diſcipline. But be it that ſome one man had written without ground or reaſon contrarie to the ſcriptures, ſhal that or any mannes abuſe, blot out the credit which ſo many Churches in *France, Scotlande, Germanie, the lowe Countries*, hath brought to it, as finding it holy, peaceable, and no ſmall pillar, both of the peace of the Church and ciuill gouernement? When we conſider what inconueniences followe any matter, we muſt not conſider what ſome (whiche hold the cauſe) would haue, but what the cauſe of his owne nature will inferre. For, as the good meaning of a good man will not make a perilouſe cauſe ſafe, ſo the ill meaning of a noughtie mā, will not make a ſafe and iuſt cauſe dangerouſe. I maruaile what cauſe may be found out to make Diſcipline hurtfull to the common wealth: or what reaſon why the Magiſtrates authoritie and it, ſhoulde not dwell peaceably togither. The Kings and Rulers of Iſrael found it not ſo: The Romanes after them found it not ſo, they being Heathen, more curious to looke into ſuche matters then any: more ielouſe, more politike, moſt ielouſe ouer the Iewes of all others, becauſe of the King which they looked for to come in worldlie glorie, could neuer yet finde out any ſuch ſuſpition. In all their times it was quietly practiſed. The Kings and Princes, both Proteſtant, which haue allowed it, and popiſh (as in *France*) which haue permitted it, they haue founde no ſuch thing in it. For the ſeconde point, By what reaſon ſhould the Magiſtrats authoritie be at ſuch enimitie with Diſcipline, or diſcipline with it? Is it becauſe the Magiſtrat will or can doo that, which the Elders doe, or the Elders will or can doe that which he doth? Will the Magiſtrat watche ouer particular flockes, admoniſhe euery ſinner they finde out, followe menne by ſpirituall meanes, till they bring them to repentance? will they them ſel

2. *Chro.* 19.
11. *Iere.* 19. 1.
Heſ. 10. 8.
2. *Reg.* 6.
1. *Sam.* 30. 27
28, 29, 30.
Actes 4. 5. & 6, 12. & 5. 21
Act. 23. 14.
25. 16. & 25, 15.

nes execute the ſpirituall cenſures of ſuſpentiõ, excommunication, and ſuch like? Is this his office, or can his conſcience beare this burthen? Doeth the Elders meddle with any ciuill cauſe, or vſe anye other meanes then which are ſpirituall? Shall they doe things ſo cloſely, that al their actes may not be ſeene of the Magiſtrate, if he ſuſpect any thinges? Nay, muſt not all thinges they doo, come to open knowledge, if they paſſe a priuate admonition? Will they bring no good to the common wealthe: meete with no ſeedes of ſedition? Shall they not be able to giue notice of the diſpoſitions of al men? Shall they not finde out Ieſuites and all heretikes, and bring them to light? Shall not the ſmaler vices and ſometimes foule ones alſo, whiche the lawe nowe meddleth little with, by this meanes bee cutt off? In deede, then mens purſes ſhoulde not bee picked, as they are nowe. Then ſo manye Veluet coates ſhould not be maintayned by ſpiritual reuenewes. But I will ſpeake no more of theſe matters. Only I conclude, ſeeing men haue in the tyme of proſperitie more neede of admonition and wholſome Diſcipline: ſeing the Elderſhip doth nothing which the Magiſtrat doeth, nor can any way hurte him, but he may ſee it better ordred then in perſecution: that as this order is neceſſarie alwayes, ſo eſpecially in the time of peace. The Lord giueʋs all to be of one minde, to ſee the trueth, and practiſe it.